UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HON. BARBARA A. McAULIFFE, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MOTION HEARING

NATHAN DANIEL LARSON,

Defendant.

Fresno, California

Friday, April 30, 2021

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

For the Plaintiff: United States Attorney's Office

BY: **BRIAN ENOS** 2500 Tulare Street

Suite 4401

Fresno, California 93721

For the Defendant: Wanger Jones Helsley

BY: PETER JONES

265 East River Park Circle

Suite 310

Fresno, California 93720

REPORTED BY: KAREN HOOVEN, RMR, CRR, Official Court Reporter

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer aided transcription.

1 Friday, April 30, 2021 Fresno, California 2 2:32 p.m. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Larson has joined us. The United States versus Nathan Daniel Larson. Case number 21-22. 4 5 May I have your appearances for the record starting with the 6 government. 7 MR. ENOS: Brian Enos, United States. 8 MR. JONES: Peter Jones for Mr. Larson, who is 9 present. We are appearing by way of video conference and Mr. 10 Larson has, prior to this, entered an opposition to appearing 11 via video conference. I believe he did submit, however, in 12 his motion filed this morning that he would agree to appear by 13 way of video conference today. Is that correct, Mr. Larson? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 THE COURT: I did not see a motion filed today. So 16 someone can indicate that to me, what that is. 17 MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor. Did you receive it, Mr. 18 Enos? 19 MR. ENOS: Yes. I finished reading it at about 1:30 20 I received it after a 12 o'clock meeting I had. I 21 believe it was filed between 11:30 and 12 or around 11:30. 22 MR. JONES: Correct. Mr. Larson contacted me 23 yesterday. We obtained it as soon as we could. There's no 24 way he could have mailed it. And in order to try to accommodate everybody, we picked it up at the jail and I filed 25

it this morning. It is his handwritten motion to proceed prose at this hearing regarding the issue of his competency.

THE COURT: I'm not determining competency here today. All I'm going to be determining is whether -- what comes first. Faretta or competency. So --

MR. JONES: That's the issue he addressed. He believes Faretta would come first.

THE COURT: All right. And I have not read it. I would -- if you need me to read it, we could take a short break or I could continue this until Monday. So it's -- I don't know, I'm looking at it now. It's up to the parties.

THE DEFENDANT: Which way is the court leaning on this?

THE COURT: Which way am I leaning? I am leaning towards that it is -- well, my tentative ruling is that the competency hearing must come first because the law requires that in order to be able to waive your right to be represented by counsel, you must do that competently and it must also be knowing and intelligently.

But competency comes first. Competency does not necessarily mean that you are -- there's a -- I don't know what the medical term is, but in saying it could be a mental defect, according to the law. And I'm not attributing any of this to you; right? You understand that? All I'm saying is what comes first is the competency determination based upon

the law as I have seen it.

THE DEFENDANT: How about if the Court read the motion before issuing the ruling?

THE COURT: All right. We could take a short recess and allow me to do that and then come back. Mr. Enos, what's your position?

MR. ENOS: Whatever the Court prefers is fine. I will say that it was ten handwritten pages and some of the font comes out light. And so it took me a solid 30 to 45 minutes to work my way through it. I just wanted to brace the Court for that. It's not going to be a, hey, here's a one-pager that I can quickly digest. I don't mind coming back on Monday. I also don't mind waiting for the Court today.

THE COURT: Mr. Jones?

MR. JONES: I agree. Either way is fine. I'm available Monday afternoon and I'm happy to wait now, take a break and --

THE COURT: Why don't we do this. Why don't we take a break now. It's 2:38. Come back on the record back at 3:15. And then if I haven't had enough time and I feel I need more time to really digest the arguments that he's making, then we'll continue it over until Monday. But at this point I'd like to be able to read it and see if we can resolve the issues today. But I'm not going to rush it.

All right. Any problem with that, Mr. Enos? You're

available?

MR. ENOS: I'm available. All I'm going to do is turn off my video and audio and I'll turn them back on at 3:15.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we'll be back in session at 3:15. All right.

MR. ENOS: Thank you.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: Let's go back on the record in United

States versus Nathan Larson. Case number 21-22. Plaintiff's
counsel is present. Defense counsel is present. Mr. Larson
is also present via video.

So I did read the handwritten pages attached to docket number 20. And it starts at page 4 of the electronic docket. And I understand Mr. Larson, as he said, he wants to represent himself in the competency hearing. He wants to make motions a lawyer can't make. Reiterates that he has a fundamental right to represent himself. And he has some issues about putting medical information on the record, maybe not quite so much that, but the competency evaluation in 2009. That can all be raised at the competency hearing.

I understand -- you know, I understand the basic principle that Mr. Larson wishes me to conduct a limited Faretta colloquy today. But as I read this letter, I have some concerns. I mean, I am not a mental health or medical

doctor, mental health or physical doctor of any sort. And, you know, there's -- Mr. Larson has expressed distrust of the mental health system, claims he is a dissident and it was engaging, I think, in civil disobedience is at issue in this case.

I can't pinpoint anything here. And really it's not for me to decide that. He's asked for a limited Faretta colloquy, as I said. And is concerned at the competency hearing that he will have to sit as a potted plant and not be able to have input. But frankly, Mr. Larson -- I've had two hearings with Mr. Larson and he's not been a potted plant. He's been very respectful. I don't want that to be on the record that he hasn't been. He's been very respectful. But he's made his position well known. The Court has heard him. I've read his documents.

And I can't imagine that the district judge who will hear this competency motion would do otherwise. If Mr. Larson filed something, depending on what he files, or the volume of what he files, what he wants to say at the competency hearing, I'm sure he will be asked and will be heard in that respect.

But at this point, I cannot say that he is completely competent to represent himself, even in a limited capacity.

Nor is that the law. The United States Supreme Court says that he must be competent to represent himself. And competency has a full range -- again, I am not a mental health

expert here. Has a full range of what various aspects of mental health. And so I cannot do a limited *Faretta* inquiry.

I think your concern, Mr. Larson -- and I'll speak directly to you at this point. Your concern is not being heard and your issues not being addressed. I think you're going to be heard. You're concerned about that. And I can understand why you would be concerned about that. But as I have, in the past two hearings, I've read what you've submitted, I've listened to you. The District Judge is going to do the same. Because, after all, it's your competency. So -- and it's an issue dealing with you specifically. So you're going to be heard.

So the Court is going to deny the request for the limited *Faretta* colloquy to determine whether Mr. Larson can represent himself at the competency hearing. Deny that request. And I'm going to set a briefing schedule and we'll move from there.

So, Mr. Enos, you said three weeks. I'm hoping it's less than three weeks now that we've gone a few days. What are you anticipating for filing?

MR. ENOS: Same as what was discussed on April 28th.

I anticipate being able to file by May 19th. And more specifically, it's going to be a motion for a competency exam. With the exam, I think the Court would be able to ultimately determine -- or use that examination to ultimately make a

competency determination. And the range of statutes is 18 USC 4241 through 47, that's where -- the basis of the government's motion will be within those, that statutory range.

THE COURT: Right. All right. Mr. Jones?

MR. JONES: Is that the date for the hearing --

THE COURT: No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JONES: -- or the date to file a motion to have Mr. Larson evaluated and the hearing will come -- and I'll have an opportunity to respond and then it will be set for hearing today or after the motion is filed?

THE COURT: All right. So the way this will work, Mr. Enos is not actually moving to determine whether he's competent or not, it's just determining whether there should be a competency exam. So there is certain threshold evidence to be presented. He is filing his motion on May 19th. You will have an opposition -- a time to oppose the motion. The government will file a reply. I will set a date for a And this will be before Judge Drozd for an in court hearing. hearing. I'm going to set a date, but what may happen is that date may either be advanced or it may be continued depending on Judge Drozd' schedule. And, you know, obviously if it's an in court proceeding, it's going to have to accommodate, you know, everybody and that has to get scheduled out and arranged and all of that for safety issues.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, what do you think about

the point I raised in my motion if my self-representation is delayed, my attorney and the other parties in the case may be doing things and making decisions that I might not be able to take back once I'm representing myself because it will already be fait accompli?

THE COURT: I understand that you're concerned about that. But Mr. Jones is not going to be, for instance, making a decision on whether you should be entering a plea or whether you should -- I mean, he's going to be doing what he would normally do, which is get all of the discovery. There is no hearings, no trial set, no pretrial set. He's getting the discovery. To the extent he can review that with you in your -- really, you know, we haven't even discussed how it would be if you represented yourself. How would you even review that evidence? And so -- and I don't want to tackle that at this point, but I will at some point if you're able to represent yourself. But Mr. Jones, at this point, can get the evidence and -- I don't think he's going to be making decisions without you.

All right. Mr. Jones, if Mr. Enos is filing his motion on May 19th, what date do you want to file? Three weeks after?

MR. JONES: Let's go two weeks.

THE COURT: Two weeks. By June 2. June 2 opposition.

1 MR. JONES: Yes. That will work. 2 THE COURT: All right. And reply, Mr. Enos? 3 MR. ENOS: I think one week should suffice for a 4 reply. 5 THE COURT: June 9 for a reply. And I'm going to set 6 a hearing, an in-court hearing for June 18. June 18. Friday, 7 June 18 at nine o'clock. 8 THE CLERK: Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 THE CLERK: I just sent Irma an instant message and I 11 asked her if she had a preference as to date and time. And she said she would prefer Thursday at 10:30. Thursdays are 12 13 set for miscellaneous items. 14 THE COURT: So June 17th? Because I know he's in 15 trial the next week. So June 17 at 10:30? 16 MR. JONES: That's agreeable with the defense. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MR. ENOS: That's fine with the government as well. 19 THE COURT: All right. So motion filed by May 19. 20 Opposition June 2. Reply June 9 with a hearing date on June 21 17 at 10:30. That's an in court proceeding. Yes, Mr. Larson. 22 THE DEFENDANT: Could I have a word with my attorney, 23 please? 24 THE COURT: I'm sorry, could you what? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Could I have a word with my attorney,

1 please? 2 THE COURT: Yes. So you want to go -- we'll put you 3 in a break out room. 4 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 5 THE COURT: All right. You just stay there and we'll 6 electronically move you. Stay in that room and we're going to 7 electronically move you to a room where -- electronically move 8 you so just the two of you are on the screen together and we 9 can't hear what you're saying. THE DEFENDANT: It's giving me an option, join 10 11 the -- should I call the deputy to hit "join" or what? 12 THE COURT: I think maybe you should call the deputy 13 and when he comes in, I'll tell him you need to hit that 14 button. 15 THE MARSHAL: Your Honor, I'm contacting him right 16 now. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 18 Officer, if you could hit "join." I want him to be 19 able to talk privately with his attorney. 20 All right. We'll be in recess until they come back. 21 (Recess.) 22 THE COURT: We're back on the record. Defense 23 counsel is present, Mr. Larson is present as well as Mr. Enos. 24 Okay. So that's where we are. We've set the dates. 25 Anything I need to address, Mr. Jones?

1 MR. JONES: No. We're -- we've discussed those 2 We're okay with those dates. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MR. JONES: Well, under the circumstances, obviously, 5 Mr. Larson's opposed to proceeding on any kind of competency 6 But with the Court's ruling in mind, he's agreeable, 7 we're agreeable to those dates. 8 Okay. Yes, his objection is noted for THE COURT: 9 the record. And Mr. Enos, do you have a motion for the Court? 10 MR. ENOS: I'm sorry, do I have what for the Court? 11 THE COURT: The motion. To exclude time. 12 MR. ENOS: Yes. I'm sorry. For the reasons stated 13 today, including marshalling additional evidence in support of 14 the government's pending motion, analyzing current evidence. 15 still working on supplemental discovery, et cetera, the 16 government does move for a time waiver through the date of the 17 Court's hearing on June 17, 2021. 18 THE COURT: All right. I assume there's an objection 19 to that? 20 MR. JONES: Yes. 21 THE COURT: All right. So the Court will overrule 22 that objection and time is excluded pursuant to 18 USC Section 23 3161(h)(1)(A) for proceedings related to determine the mental 24 capacity of the defendant as well as other issues for the 25 reasons Mr. Enos stated on the record.

1 I think that's everything we need to address today. 2 Is there anything else, Mr. Enos? 3 The only thing I'd do is add provision MR. ENOS: 4 (h)(1)(D), once the motion is filed through the date of the 5 hearing or other prompt disposition of the motion. That's an additional basis for a time waiver for that time period, which 6 7 would be May 19 through June 17. 8 THE COURT: Yes. Agreed. Mr. Jones, anything 9 further? 10 MR. JONES: No. 11 THE DEFENDANT: May I go to -- after the hearing, can 12 I go into the break out again with my lawyer? 13 THE COURT: Yes. But only -- because the Court will 14 be in recess then. We'll be done. I won't be bringing you 15 back in to discuss this further. But I'll give you about ten 16 minutes to discuss with your attorney whatever you might need 17 to discuss. And the courtroom deputy will stay to close out 18 the hearing. Close out the zoom hearing. Okay? So she'll 19 put you back in a break out room. 20 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Court's in 22 recess. 23 MR. ENOS: Thank you. 24 (The proceedings were concluded at 3:35 p.m.) 25

Case 1:21-cr-00022-NONE-SKO Document 41 Filed 06/10/21 Page 14 of 14